

### **Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Upon entry of this amendment claims 1-3, 11, 18, 41, 43, 44, 54-62, 95, 96, 98-109 and 111 would now be pending, claims 4-10, 12-17, 19-40, 42, 45-52, 63-94, 97 and 110 having been cancelled. Thus, the total number of pending claims after entry of the amendment will have been reduced.

Claims 1, 43 and 61 have been amended to eliminate the recitation that R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup> may be connected by a linking group E to yield a cyclic structure. Claims 3, 62, 95, 96, and 109 have been amended consistent with the change to claims 1, 43 and 61. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendment under Rule 116 is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner noted allowable subject matter in claims 3, 11, 18, 41, 54-57, 60, 95, 96, 98-101, 103-109 and 111 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.<sup>1</sup> Based on the foregoing amendments, applicants believe that the amended claims, which eliminate the recitation of the linking group between R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup> and the corresponding cyclic moiety, place all of the claims in a form that originally lead to the Examiner's indication of allowability of the noted claims.

Claims 1, 2, 36, 43, 44, 58, 59, 61, 62, 89, 97, 102, 103 and 110 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iwata et al., CAPLUS Abstract 116:214490 (1992). The Office Action specifically cites compound RN 140893-46-5.

---

<sup>1</sup> The indication of allowable subject matter in claim 103 appears to have been an error, as this claim also is listed in the rejected claims.

Since the cyclic structure which was the basis for this rejection has now been removed from the claims, the rejection is no longer applicable. The rejection is thus respectfully traversed.

Reconsideration and the allowance of the pending claims are thus respectfully requested. As discussed in today's brief telephone conference, the Examiner is requested to call applicants undersigned representative in the event that the amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Joseph M. Skerpon  
Reg. No. 29,864

Date: September 20, 2005

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
1001 G Street, N.W., Eleventh Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
(202) 824-3000

905548-3